To appear in PLC 4
File 336
acc 2198

Natural Absolutivity in Indo-Aryan

Peter Edwin Hook
University of Michigan & Cornell University

ABSTRACT: During the past twenty years a number of linguists have attempted to provide functionalist explanations for the origin and development of the ergative-absolutive pattern in agreement and/or case-marking that is found in a large subset of the world's languages: DeLancey (1981), Du Bois (1987), Estival and Myhill (1988), Hopper (1983), and Klaiman (1978) (among others). Using material from Indic, I show that a functionalist explanation can be at best only partly successful: There are languages in which one absolutive pattern for agreement in the verb co-exists with a different one for the adverb. Furthermore, it is the absolutive pattern shown by the adverb rather (than the pattern shown by the verb) that is more amenable to a functionalist interpretation. END OF ABSTRACT.

As is well known almost all the languages spoken in the western and northern areas of the Indo-Aryan arena feature a tensually split pattern of absolutivity such that a transitive verb agrees with its direct object in non-durative past and perfect tenses (a) and with its subject in others (b) while intransitives agree only with their subjects <1>:

(a) pora baaher gel-i aaNi (tyaa ni) kulphi ghetl-i
child-npl out went-npl and they ERG kulfi-fsg took-fsg
'The children went out and bought kulfi.' (Marathi)
(b) pora baaher dzaa-til aaNi (ti) kulphi ghe-til
child-npl out go-FUT3pl and they kulfi take-FUT3pl
"The children will go out and buy kulfi.'

Agreement with the direct object is usually limited to features of gender and number but in some languages of the extreme north, person is implicated as well <2>:

(c) az pok-u-s bi yoor
today walked-msg-1sg I-NOM here
'Today I walked here.' (Kashmiri)
(d) tamyi suuz-u-s bi yoor
she-ERG sent-msg-1sg I-NOM here
'She sent me here.'

OIA transitive verbs always agree with their agents:

(e) tvam ... prathamaḥ pītim arhasi RV 1.134.6ab
you-NOM first-NOM drink-ACCfsg deserve-2sg
'You (Vayu) deserve a drink (of Soma) first...'

unless they are in the passive voice:

(f) vadan grāvā + ava vedim bhri-yā-te RV 5.31.12c
rumbling stone-NOM down altar bear-PASS-3sg <3>
'The rumbling press-stone is brought to the altar...'
(g) andhena yat tamasā pravṛtā + āsīt AV 18.3.3c
blind-INS since dark-INS covered-NOM was
'As (she) was enclosed with blind darkness...'

It is believed by some that the ergative-absolutive pattern of verb agreement found in NIA had its sources in constructions like that of (g) which in the simple past and perfect ultimately replaced constructions like that of (e). A precise account of this change remains to be worked out <4>.

In this paper I discuss a second kind of absolutivity, one only recently recognized as such in NIA <5> and which, in OIA, has missed notice altogether until now. In western NIA languages certain adverbs of manner and of place show absolutive patterns of agreement that are independent of tense. Instances can be adduced from Marathi:

(h) ti tsaangl-i vaag-el
she good-fsg behave-FUT3sg
'She will behave well.'
(i) ti haa bhaag tsaangl-aa vaats-el
she this part-msg good-msg read-FUT3sg
'She will read this part well.'

from Gujarati ((j) is from Cardona 1965:149; the transcription is mine):

(j) raam paach-o gayo
Ram back-msg went-msg
'Ram went back.'
(k) baaki paysaa paach-aa aapšo-ji
remaining money-mpl back-mpl give-HON
'Be so kind as to remit the remaining money.'

from Sindhi (exx. from Trumpp 1970:380 <6>):

(l) ghaN-o ru-e th-o
much-msg cry-3sg stand-msg
'(He) cries a lot.'
(m) huu ruG-ii maanii khaa-e th-o
he only-fsg bread-fsg eat-3sg stand-msg
'He only eats bread.'

from Panjabi (exx. from D. Magier, personal communication):

(n) xadiijaa caukh-ii sondii-e
Khadija-fsg often-fsg sleeps
'Khadija sleeps a lot.'
(o) aarif mer-iyAA film-AA caukh-iyAA vekhdaa-e (Colloquial. KCB)
'Arif my-fpl film-fpl often-fpl sees
'Arif often sees my films.'

and, in the far north (Jammu and Kashmir), from Poguli:

(p) as saa ter-i peni le-m-an
we-NOM her-NOM there-fsg send pour-1pl-3sg
'We shall send her there.'
(q) baabu tin-u kor-u go
father-NOM your-msg where-msg went
'Where did your father go?'

In some languages this absolutive pattern is found even for postpositions <7> (exx. from Ashok K. Koul, pers. comm.):

(r) temyis kyits lyeekhi bi ciThy (Kashmiri)
him-OBL for-fsg write-FUT I letter-fsg
'I will write a letter for him.'
(s) asyi kyuth pyov ruud
us-OBL for-msg fell rain-msg
'It rained for us.'
(t) asyi kyits keri-n tiir
us-OBL for-fsg made-3sERG cold-fsg
'It is cold for us.'

Not long ago Mohabbat Singh Man Singh Chauhan and I, in field work near Abu, found languages in which adverbs with purely aspectual function exhibit the same pattern: In (u) the adverb par-, reflex of an IA stem that means 'further' or 'away' (Turner #7793 and #8100), indicates completeness in the conceptualization of the action khaav- 'eat':

(u) vau Haari-e miTaai khaav-ai ni par-i (Bhitrauti)
he-NOM all-EMP candy-fsg eat-3sg not AWAY-fsg <8>, <9>
'I hope he doesn't eat up all the candy.'

In (v-w) the adverb ur-, cognate with an IA adverb 'in this direction' or 'here' (Turner #810), has the same function:

(v) ghar-e padhaar-au ur-aa (Bhitrauti)
house-LOC come(HON)-IMPER HERE-mpl
'Come in, please!'
(w) vaNi-n isTesan-e laav ur-i
her-DAT station-to bring HERE-fsg
'Bring her to the station.'

Kellogg (1938:303) reports the finite verb extended with par- or var- as being the standard counterpart in Marwari of the NIA compound verb. In Marwari texts available to me this is not the case: Compound verbs, while infrequent, do exist, and par- and ur- usually retain their interpretability as directional adverbs ('away from/towards here'):

(x) mevaaR jejiyo laagai chai su par-o choR-aav-o
Mewar jaziya-msg applies is that AWAY-msg quit-CAUS-IMP
'Get the jaziya that Mewar must pay lifted.' Nainsi 1.55

(y) aap aav-ai tarai gaadii ur-ii lev-ai
selves come-3pl then throne-fsg HERE-fsg take-3pl
'On returning they take the throne back.' Naiṇsi 1.267

Notice however that they exhibit the same tense-independent absolutive agreement pattern of their congeners near Abu.

In Vedic Sanskrit there existed a family of adverbs of place or direction that in meaning and syntactic behavior show striking resemblances to the Rajasthani forms par- and ur-. These include the stems parāñc- 'away', arvāñc- 'this way; down' and viṣvañc- 'in every direction' <10>. Like the Rajasthani forms these agreed in gender and number with the subjects of intransitives (z) and direct objects of transitives (aa and bb) <11>:

(z) parāṅ amitraḥ + eṣatv arvācī gaur upeṣatu
away-NOMmsg enemy-msg go-3sg here-NOMfsg cow-fsg come
'May the enemy go away (from us). May (his) cow come towards (us).' AV 6.67.3cd

(aa) arvāñcam indram amuto havāmahe
here-ACCmsg Indra-ACCmsg there-from call-1pl
'Hitherward do we call Indra from yonder...'
AV 5.3.11a as rendered by Whitney, 1.227.

(bb) amitrān ... parāca indra pra-mṛṇā jahī ca
enemies-ACCmpl away-ACCmpl Indra crush kill and
'O Indra, crush and kill (our) enemies!' RV 6.44.17

In these citations the forms in ac- (strong stem añc- <12>), while morphologically indistinguishable from adjectives, do not express characteristics or inherent properties of their apparent heads but rather the states or locations which the referents of such heads may enter as a result of the action expressed by the finite verb. They function as members of the (resultative subset of the) category adverb.

There are important differences between resultative adverbs in Vedic and what appear to be their reflexes in NIA: the open-endedness of the class of these adverbs in Vedic and the ability of many of them to function as attributive adjectives as well as adverbs - a property not found in the NIA items. One difference especially is to be noted: The NIA adverbs agree with intransitive subjects or transitive objects in gender and number only while their putative precursors in Vedic show agreement in gender, number and case. It was only with the subsequent collapse of the nominative and accusative cases in MIA that the pattern of agreements shown in (z), (aa), and (bb) is transformed to one of overt absolutivity. This, according to Bloch (1965:166), occurred in the Apabhramsa period, some 2000 years later <13>.

Adverbial agreement in Vedic is not limited to resultatives. Adverbs of other types also show agreement with one or another noun phrase in their clause. But the pattern is not simply an absolutive one. By examining that pattern one can see that the covert absolutivity of resultatives falls

out as the natural consequence of a more general functional principle governing adverbial agreements in Vedic.

The bases prathama 'first' and uttama 'last' are used both as adjectives and ordinal adverbs in Vedic. As adverbs in transitive clauses they agree sometimes with the subject (e and cc) and sometimes with the object (dd and ee):

(cc) daśagvāḥ prathamā yajñam ūhire
Dashagvas-NOMmpl first-NOMmpl sacrifice-ACC brought-3pl
'The Dashagvas first brought the sacrifice.' RV 2.34.12

(dd) sa vai samīmayim prathamām ādadhati
he-NOM then samīmayi-ACCfsg first-ACCfsg put-3sg
'So he (the yajman) puts in the "samīmayi" fuel first.'
śatapatha brāhmaṇa 9.2.3.37

(ee) prāṇā...saptamī citis tām uttamām upādadhati
soul seventh layer that-ACCfsg last-ACCfsg put-3sg
'The seventh layer is the soul so he adds that last.'
śatapatha brāhmaṇa 8.7.4.21

In instances such as (cc) where the same event is performed by a series of different subjects the adverb agrees with the subject. In (dd) and (ee) the same subject is performing the same act on a series of different objects. There the adverb agrees with the object <14>.

In a later hymn, addressed to the prototypical bride, where a mystical series of male figures is described as obtaining her, it is with the subject that the ordinal adverb agrees. In this instance, the object noun phrase referring to the discourse topic ('you' or 'the bride') is zeroed:

(ff) somaḥ prathamo vivide gandharvo vivida uttaraḥ
Soma-NOM first-NOM got Gandharva-NOM got next-NOM
'Soma obtained (you as wife) first; Gandharva, next.'
RV 10.85.40ab

In effect the adverb agrees with the noun phrase which is not the discourse topic, i.e. with the noun phrase which is "new". This difference is particularly striking in the following pair of examples. The god Indra is grammatical subject in each of them, but in (gg) Indra is the topic of the hymn, whereas in (hh) he appears only as an incidental figure in a hymn dedicated to the horse. In (hh) prathama agrees with Indra; in (gg) it does not:

(gg) indrasya nu vīryāni pravocam yāni cakāra prathamāni
Indra's now deeds-ACC say-1sg which did-3sg first-ACC
'I will declare Indra's deeds, (the ones) which he did first.' RV 1.32.1ab (a hymn to Indra)

(hh) yamena dattam ... indra enam prathamo adhyatiṣṭhat
Yama-IN given-ACC Indra-NOM him first-NOM mounted-3sg
'(The horse which) Yama gave ... Indra mounted first.'
RV 1.163.2ab (a hymn to the sacrificial horse)

This inverse relation of adverbial agreement in Vedic with topics of discourse should probably be regarded as a kind of epiphenomenon. Adverbs like 'first' or 'next' refer to some member of a set defined by the property that all its members bear the same relation to some action. Members of such sets are unlikely to have the same referent. Hence, they often denote entities that are being introduced to the discourse register. It is the very meaning of such adverbs, then, that lies at the root of their high rate of agreement with "new" topics in discourse.

Resultatives in añc-/ac- are special cases of a general rule in Vedic:

(ii) Adverbs, if they agree at all <15>, must agree with the noun phrase that falls within the scope of their predication <16>.

Since the result of the action of some X on Y is most often confined to Y or most noticeable in Y, the meaning of resultative adverbs as a class makes them unlikely candidates to function as (secondary) predicates to transitive subjects:

(jj) The ball rolled away.
(kk) We rolled the ball away. (We are still here.)
(ll) viṣvaṅco asmac charavaḥ patantu
all-sides-NOMmpl us-ABL arrows-NOMmpl fly-OPT3pl
'May (our) arrows fly to every quarter!' AV 1.19.2
(mm) ārāc charavyā asmad viṣūcīr pātaya
far volleys-ACCfpl us-ABL all-sides-ACCfpl make-fly
'Make the volleys of arrows fly far away in every direction from us, Indra!' AV 1.19.1

Thus, the very nature of events ensures an absolutive pattern of agreement for resultative adverbs in Vedic. It is in this sense that such a pattern is "natural", or at least more natural than the pattern of most modern western Indo-Aryan languages where all adverbs which agree must do so on an absolutive basis without regard for meaning or scope. For example, in Gujarati a temporal adverb agrees with the direct object even if it is the subject that falls under its scope:

(nn) baapu-jii maar-ii ben ne savaare vel-ii (*vel-aa)
Father-HON my-fsg sister DAT morning early-fsg -mpl
jagaaRe che paN hU tene moR-ii (*moR-o) jagaaRU chU
wake-3plPR but I-msg her late-fsg -msg wake-1sgPR
'Father wakes my sister early in the morning but I wake her late.' (example from Radhekant Dave, pers. com.)

This pattern in turn is less arbitrary than the one found in the Indo-Aryan verb where absolutive agreement is no more than an automatic concomitant of the morphological structure of certain tenses.

Endnotes

* The present paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper, presented in March 1989 at the Silver Jubilee of the Delhi University Linguistics Department, and which will be published in the proceedings under the title Covert Absolutivity in Vedic. I must express my thanks to George Cardona and to Bill Darden for insightful comments they made on the earlier version which led to a more general formulation of the adverbial agreement pattern in Vedic Sanskrit.

<1> Abbreviations include:

ABL.....ablative	INS.....instrumental
ACC.....accusative	l.....line
CAUS.....causative suffix	LOC.....locative
DAT.....dative	m.....masculine
EMP.....emphatic particle	n.....neuter
ERG.....ergative	NOM.....nominative
f.....feminine	OBL.....oblique
FUT.....future	OPT.....optative
GEN.....genitive	PR.....present
HON.....honorific	PST.....past
IMPER.....imperative	pl.....plural
INF.....infinitive	sg.....singular

In the transcription of NIA languages, doubling of a symbol indicates contrastive length; capitalization of vowels, nasality; of apical stops, retroflexion; B and G, implosives; and S, palatal esh. Underlining of vowels indicates murmur or breathy register. The transcription of OIA is the traditional one except that I use "+" to split sandhis involving elision of a vowel.

<2> In the transcription of Kashmiri, i represents a high, central, unrounded vowel; e, a mid, central, unrounded one; and y, palatalization of a preceding sound.

<3> Notice that the thing moved is the subject, and not the destination, even though in the active both get the accusative case. See discussion ad Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.52 in Kāśikā.

<4> See Régamey 1954, Klaiman 1978, Estival and Myhill 1988

<5> See Hook 1982, Magier 1986, Hook and Chauhan 1988.

<6> It is hard to reconcile Trumpp's examples with what he has to say about the pattern: "...the adjective, agreeing in gender and number with the subject referred to, is employed, where we would use an adverb as a complement to the verb..." (p. 380) unless we take his word "subject" to mean 'that with which the adjective agrees'.

<7> Navalkar (1894:313) reports this for Marathi, too:

(a) tyaas bhovat-e vis hatti ubh-e hot-e
him-OBL around-mpl 20 elephants-mpl stand-mpl were-mpl
'Twenty elephants stood around him.'

<8> The transcription system used here for Bhitrauti is the same as that used for other NIA languages. The symbol /H/, however, represents a voiceless glottal fricative (usually corresponding to western NIA /s/). It contrasts with voiced /h/: /Haati/ 'companion' vs. /haati/ 'elephant'.

<9> Similar extensions of the finite verb can be found in the Himachali languages Kotgarhi and Kochi, but without the absolutive agreement pattern. See Hendriksen 1979:19, l. 12.
<10> For suggested derivations of parāñc-, arvāñc- viṣvañc-, etc. from adverbs or verbal prefixes to which is suffixed a formant ac/añc of diverse origins see Schmidt 1889, Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954:156-7, and Mayrhofer 1986 (passim)
<11> A counterexample to the (covert) absolutive pattern of agreement set forth here would be a resultative adverb that occurs with a transitive predicate but agrees with the subject rather than the object. Among the approximately forty instances of resultative adverbs in ac- or añc- that I have examined, one or two possible counterexamples have emerged:

(a) stomāḥ ... tubhyam asmadryañco dadato maghāni
hymns-NOMmpl you-DAT usward-NOMmpl giving riches-ACCnpl
'These hymns, ...giving us riches, ...(are) to you.'
RV 7.19.10 (ACCnpl form asmadryañci expected)

(b) ā tvā harayo ... asmatrāñco vṛṣaṇo ... vahantu
P you-ACCsg bay-NOMpl usward-NOMpl stallions bring-OPT
'Let the bay stallions (speeding?) toward us bring you!'
RV 6.44.19 (ACCmsg form asmatrāñcam expected?)

Arguing that the finite predicate in (a) is a deleted copula (and that asmadryañco is in construction with it, rather than with the transitive participle dadato) would bring (a) into line with the other instances. For (b) one would have to show that the form asmatrāñcaḥ 'towards us' has been employed attributively of harayaḥ 'bay horses' or of vṛṣaṇaḥ 'stallions' rather than in a resultative sense with respect to tvā 'you'. It seems impossible to resolve this question on the basis of the given utterance and its context.
<12> For morphology of parāñc-, etc. see Whitney 1879:137-8.
<13> Although the adverbial stems and the patterns of their agreement in Vedic and in, say, modern Marwari appear quite similar, it is impossible to conclude that the contemporary forms are direct descendants of the Vedic forms rather than independent developments of the past five hundred years.
<14> A similar agreement pattern may be discerned for the quantifier eka 'only, alone':

(a) kutas tvam indra māhināḥ sann eko yāsi
whence you-NOM Indra powerful being one-NOM come-2sg
'Indra, (who) are so powerful, where are you coming from alone?' RV 1.165.3a (cf (z))

(b) eko + ajuryo dayate vasūni (cf (cc))
one-NOMmsg eternal-NOMmsg give-3sg treasure-ACCnpl
'(Indra) alone, eternal, bestows treasures.'

(c) mām ekam samadhatta + ahi-hatye (cf (dd))
me-ACCmsg one-ACCmsg charged-2pl dragon-killing-DAT
'You commanded me alone to kill the dragon.' RV 1.165.6

It seems, however, that eka has less tendency to float away from the noun that it quantifies: compare its behavior with that of uttara in (ff) and prathama in (gg) and (hh).
<15> An invariant neuter singular form is a morphological alternative in Vedic for most of the adverbs discussed here:

(a) eva me śatror mūrdhānam viṣvag bhiṅddhi sahasva ca
so my enemy's head-msg-ACC apart-nsg break overpower &
'so the head of my foe do thou split apart and overcome.'
AV 3.6.6cd as rendered by Whitney 1:93

<16> This may not be far from what Trumpp intended with his cryptic remark about the Sindhi adverb's agreeing with 'the subject referred to'. See fn <6>.

References

Allen, W.S. 1960. Notes on the Rajasthani verb. IL 21:4-13.

Bloch, J. 1953. Application de la Cartographie à l'Histoire de l'Indo-Aryen. Paris: Imprimérie Nationale.

Bloch, J. 1965. Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times. A. Master, tr. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.

Bloch, J. 1960. Les Inscriptions d'Asoka. "Belles Lettres".

Cardona, George. 1965. A Gujarati Reference Grammar. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Comrie, B. 1978. Ergativity. In Syntactic Typology: Studies in the Phenomenology of Language. W.P. Lehmann, editor. Austin: University of Texas Press. Pp. 329-394.

DeLancey, S. 1981. An Interpretation of Split Ergativity and Related Patterns. Language 57:626-657.

Delbruck, B. 1888. Altindische Syntax. Halle: Waisenhaus.

Devi Chand. 1982. The Atharvaveda. New Delhi: Munshiram.

Du Bois, John W. 1987. 'The Discourse Basis of Ergativity'. Language 63:805-855.

Estival, and J. Myhill. 1988. Formal and functional aspects of the development from passive to ergative systems. M. Shibatani, Ed. Passive and Voice. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gaedicke, C. 1880. Der Accusativ im Veda. Breslau: Koebner.

Gonda, J. 1951. Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. E.J. Brill

Grassmann, H. 1955. Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda. Wiesbaden.

Grierson, Sir George A. 1919. Linguistic Survey of India.

Griffith, R.T.H. 1963. The Hymns of the Rgveda. Chowkhamba.

Haudry, Jean. 1977. L'Emploi des Cas en Védique. Lyon: Editions L'Hermès.

Hendriksen, Hans. 1976. Himachali Studies: Vol I Vocabulary 1979. Vol. II Texts; 1986. Vol III Grammar. Copenhagen.

Herring, Susan. 1989. Verbless presentation & the discourse basis of ergativity. To appear in CLS 25.

Hook, Peter E. 1982. South Asia as a semantic area: forms, meanings and their connections. S Asian Review 6:30-41.

Hook, Peter E. 1987. Poguli syntax in the light of Kashmiri. Studies in Linguistic Sciences 17:63-71.

Hook, Peter E., & M.M. Chauhan. 1988. The perfective adverb in Bhitrauti. WORD 39:177-186.

Hopper, P. 1983. Ergative, passive and active in Malay narrative discourse. In Discourse Perspectives on Syntax. F. Klein-Andreu, editor. New York: Academic Press.

Kellogg, S.H. 1938. A Grammar of the Hindi Language. London.

Klaiman, M. H. 1978. Arguments against a passive origin of the IA ergative. In CLS 14, pp. 204-216.

Magier, David. ms. Ergativity in the Midwest. Paper presented at the 1986 annual meeting of the Michigan Linguistic Society, Michigan State University.
Masica, C. P. 1976. Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Mayrhofer, M. 1986. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Altindoarischen. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
Navalkar, G.V. 1894. Student's Marathi Grammar. 3rd ed.
Nedjalkov, V. P., Editor. 1988 Typology of Resultative Constructions. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Régamey, C. 1954. A propos de la "construction ergative" en Indo-Aryen moderne. In Festschrift A. Debrunner. Bern.
Rgveda. 1963-6. Vishva Bandhu et al, Eds. 8 parts. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.
śatapatha brāhmaṇam. 1969. With 'Ratna Dīpikā' Hindi translation by G.P. Prasad. Delhi: Research Institute of Ancient Scientific Studies.
Schmidt, Johannes. 1889. Die Pluralbildung der indogermanischen Neutra. Weimar: H. Bohlau.
Smith, J. D. 1975. An Introduction to the language of the historical documents from Rajasthan. Modern Asian Studies 9,4:433-464.
Speijer, J.S. 1886. Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Taittirīya Saṃhitā. 1970. N.S. Sontakke and T.M. Dharmadhikari, Eds. 2 vols. Poona: Vaidika Samśodhana Mandala.
Tessitori, L. P. 1914-1916. Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani. The Indian Antiquary. Passim.
Trumpp, E. 1970. Grammar of the Sindhi Language. Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag. Reprint of the 1872 edition.
Turner, R.L. 1966. Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London: Oxford University Press.
Vishva Bandhu. 1963. A Grammatical Word Index to Atharvaveda. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Inst.
Wackernagel, J. and A. Debrunner. 1954. Altindische Grammatik. Vol. 2.2 (Die Nominalsuffixe). Göttingen: Ruprecht
Whitney, W.D. 1879. A Sanskrit Grammar. Boston: Heath & Co.
Whitney, W.D. 1962. Atharva Veda Saṃhitā. 2 vols. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.